

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-30 remain in this application. No new claims have been added.

Claims 1-30 stand rejected under 35 USC 112. The Office Action stated that "claims 1-30 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome rejection(s) under 35 USC 112, second paragraph". Claims 1 and 17 are independent claims. Claims 1 and 17 and 25 have been amended.

Drawings Objections

The drawings have been objected to as to failing to comply with 37CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "18" has been used to designate both light guide device, see line 5 of [0014] and grating, see line 4 of [0024].

Applicants amended paragraph [0024] of the specification by changing reference numeral "18" to "24" to designate grating. The reference numeral "24" has been used throughout the specification to designate gratings (see, for example, [0024]) and has also been used to designate a grating in Figs. 1 and 4.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-30 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first and second paragraphs. The Office Action stated that the claims are incomplete and omit the steps of "comparing the percentage of reflected light with a predetermined one and then either finish or continuing making the grating."

Accordingly, Claim 1 has been amended to add the following step:

(e) comparing said percentage [of step (d)] to a predetermined percentage to determine whether the grating is finished .

Similarly, Claim 17 was amended add the following step: (f) comparing said characteristic [determined in step (e)] to the desired grating characteristic to determine whether the grating is finished.

The office Action also stated that "claims 1-30 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome rejection(s) under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as set forth in this Office Action." Independent Claims 1 and 17 have been amended as required by

Appl. No.: 09/840,856
Reply to Office Action of: 9/17/03

the Examiner and, therefore, are not indefinite. Claims 2-16 depend from claim 1 as their base claim and, therefore, expressly incorporate the language of claim 1. Similarly, Claims 18-30 depend from claim 17 as their base claim and, therefore, expressly incorporate the language of claim 17. Thus, claims 2-16 and 18-30 are also not indefinite.

Conclusion

Based upon the above amendments, remarks, and papers of records, applicant believes the pending claims of the above-captioned application are in allowable form and patentable over the prior art of record. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Applicant believes that no extension of time is necessary to make this Reply timely. Should applicant be in error, applicant respectfully requests that the Office grant such time extension pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) as necessary to make this Reply timely, and hereby authorizes the Office to charge any necessary fee or surcharge with respect to said time extension to the deposit account of the undersigned firm of attorneys, Deposit Account 03-3325.

Please direct any questions or comments to Svetlana Z. Short at 607-974-0412.

Respectfully submitted,



Svetlana Z. Short
Attorney for Assignee
Reg. No. 34,432
Corning Incorporated
SP-TI-03-1
Corning, NY 14831
607-974-0412

DATE: 11/17/03